

REMARKS

The Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for thoroughly reviewing and considering the pending application. The Official Action dated October 7, 2003 has been received and carefully reviewed. Claims 1, 8 and 20 have been amended and new claims 23-26 have been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-26 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

The Official Action rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention. The Applicants have amended claim 20 as shown above and submit that claim 20 is definite and particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention. The Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Official Action also rejected claims 1-5 and 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,115,016 to *Yoshihara et al.* (hereinafter "*Yoshihara*"). The rejection of claims 1-5 and 8-11 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

#1 { As required in Chapter 2131 of the M.P.E.P., in order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), "...the reference must teach every element of the claim." The Applicants respectfully submit that *Yoshihara* does not teach every element in amended claim 1. To further illustrate, as amended, claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, a field sequential liquid crystal display panel comprising, among other elements, "... a means for controlling a lighting speed of each of light sources Red, Green and Blue, whereby the light sources are sequentially driven." The Applicants submit that *Yoshihara* does not teach this element of claim 1.

#2 { Likewise, the Applicants respectfully submit that *Yoshihara* does not teach every element claimed in claim 8. For example, claim 8 has been amended to claim a method of color image display for a field sequential liquid crystal display device including the operation of "...driving a combination of the light sources the combination having up to three colors at a fourth sub-frame where the combination of the light sources at the fourth sub-frame is determined using a reading from the image signal processor, the reading indicating a stressed color wherein the stressed color corresponds to at least one of the light sources Red, Green and Blue such that the stressed color is driven at the fourth sub-frame". The Applicants submit that *Yoshihara* does not disclose this claimed feature.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that *Yoshihara* does not disclose each and every element claimed in claims 1 and 8, as required under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and claims 1 and 8 are therefore allowable over *Yoshihara*. Claims 2-5, which depend from claim 1, and claims 9-11, which depend from claim 8, are also allowable for the reasons discussed with respect to claims 1 and 8 and for the additional novel features claimed therein.

The Official Action also rejected claims 18-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yoshihara* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,796,378 to *Yoshida et al.* (hereinafter "*Yoshida*"). The rejection of claims 18-22 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is hereby requested.

#3 { As required in Chapter 2143.03 of the M.P.E.P., in order to "establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention, all the limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." Claim 18 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 18 claims a method of color image display for a field sequential liquid crystal display device including the operation of " ...

providing a time interval between driving sections of a previous light source and a next light source.”

The Applicants respectfully submit that neither *Yoshihara* nor *Yoshida*, either singularly or in combination, disclose this feature. The Official Action alleges that *Yoshihara* discloses this feature as such:

Yoshihara discloses: a time period, which is the “less” time period, between each sub-period in which the back light is off (Yoshihara say[s] ‘the emission of the backlight for all the colors is completed within the period of 1/240 seconds or less into which the display period of 1/60 seconds or less is divided’, col. 5, lines 38-41);...

The Applicants respectfully submit that the passage referred to in the Official Action does not disclose the aforementioned feature of “providing a time interval between driving sections of a previous light source and a next light source.” Instead, the disclosure of *Yoshihara* discussed in the Official Action pertains to a method in which a “...display period is divided into at least four sub-periods,...” See col. 4, lines 18-19. In addition, *Yoshihara* further describes each period and sub-period as follows:

The displaying control method of a liquid crystal displaying apparatus of the present invention, in the above-mentioned method, each display period is 1/60 seconds or shorter, and each sub-period is 1/240 seconds or shorter.

In the above-mentioned method of the present invention, the emission of the back light for all the colors is completed within the period of 1/240 seconds or less into which the display period of 1/60 seconds or less is divided. See col. 4, lines 42-49.

Therefore, the Applicants believe that the disclosure referenced in the Official Action does not disclose the previously discussed feature of claim 18. Furthermore, the Applicants believe that *Yoshida* does not disclose this claimed feature. Therefore, the Applicants submit that the Official Action has failed to establish how the prior art discloses all of the elements

claimed in claim 18 as required under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). As such, the Applicants submit that claim 18 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over *Yoshihara* in view of *Yoshida* and respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn. Likewise, the Applicants believe that claims 19-22, which depend from claim 18, are also patentable for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 18 and the additional novel features recited therein.

The Official Action also rejected claims 6 and 7 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over *Yoshihara* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,808,597 to *Onitsuka et al.* (hereinafter "*Onitsuka*"). The rejection of claims 6 and 7 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is hereby requested. As mentioned earlier, *Yoshihara* fails to disclose each and every element of claim 1, the base claim from which claims 6 and 7 depend. The Applicants respectfully submit that *Onitsuka* does not overcome the previously discussed shortcomings of *Yoshihara*. Accordingly, the Applicants believe that claims 6 and 7 depend from an allowable claim and are therefore also allowable.


In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in an immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. Should the Examiner feel that a teleconference would further the prosecution of the pending application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the number listed below.

The Applicant hereby authorizes the Commissioner of Patents to charges any fees necessary to complete this filing, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, or credit any overpayment in fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Further, if these papers are not

considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for the necessary extension of time.

Dated: March 18, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Rebecca Goldman Rudich

Registration No.: 41,786

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorney for Applicant